

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Item #28
sent by Certified
mail,

Article # Z 403 256 238

January 1, 1999

Dear Beau,

I'm further behind on my correspondence than ever, but at least I have the corrections to Mello's book out of the way (pen just ran out) — I trust that you and he have received your respective copies of them by now — ~~not~~ and today I've just finished compiling some data about my mail for Denvir and Clarke (so that they can decide what to do about the problem of missing and damaged letters). Consequently, I now feel prepared to go over your recent letters and answer some points that, owing to haste, I've previously passed over.

First, however, ~~that~~ I'll apologize for a faux pas that I may have committed when I spoke with you by telephone on December 24. I wished you Merry Christmas, and only after you failed to respond did it occur to me that you might be Jewish, or for some other reason take a dim view of Christmas greetings. If that is the case, then I hope you will pardon me for my faux pas. I should have said "season's greetings".

As you've probably guessed, I'm not religious myself, and to me Christmas is a purely secular holiday. If I were to assign it any religious significance at all, I would connect it with the pagan winter-solstice festival from which it is descended.

I also apologize for holding up the publication of Truth versus Lies, but I felt I owed Bonnie that courtesy, since he's agreed to expend a great

deal of time and effort on my behalf without compensation.

Finally, I want to apologize for the somewhat irritable tone of some of my recent letters. As you know, I was under pressure, having more things coming at me than I could well handle.

*

Now for your recent letters.

Letter of Dec. 5, p. 3, #12. There's no need for you to apologize for anything here.

P. 3, #3. My feeling is that if this paragraph were added to the text, I would seem to be working too hard to make excuses for myself. So, if you want to include this, I think it should be relegated to a footnote (or endnote).

In fact, I'm half inclined to go further and delete from my letter of November 30, p. 3, #1 the words, "it's no harsher than some of the language my parents used to apply to me when I was a teenager, and in any case." What do you think about this?

Letter of Dec. 14, p. 1, #12. No need for you to blush. Extravert does seem to be the more common spelling nowadays. I just happen to be old enough to remember when extravert was considered the correct spelling.

P. 1, #4. Yes, Ulveman may be useful, and I think we should maintain contact with him. But does he write for English-language periodicals? I noticed that in his letters to me his English was less than perfect.

p.3, last paragraph. In case I haven't told you this before, I've concluded by this time that Gravy Greenberg is so dishonest that it would be unwise to give him any further information. But we may as well string him along for a while by letting him think that he may get interviews or ~~of~~ information later.

p.4, #2. I will send your name and address to the two writers. One of them has already written me saying that he would ~~be~~ like to be put in touch with you. His name is Derrick Jensen, and he is the author of Listening To the Land, published by Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, 1995. It's a collection of interviews with a variety of people active in environmentalism or related areas. Many of the interviews are too leftist and/or irrational for my taste. Jensen says he's become much more radical (but, I think, less leftist) than he was when he wrote Listening To the Land. He certainly is a red-hot radical if there ever was one, but on a personal level I find him quite likeable. I don't know whether you'll like his writing, but there's only one way to find out: I'll send him your name and you can see what he has to offer.

Postscript to letter of 12/14: I've received all of the letters that you list, except that dated 7/24. However, I did receive your letter of 6/24; I assume that you wrote 7/24 by mistake. Besides the letters you listed, I also received one dated 9/24 and one dated 10/14.

I have not had problems with my incoming mail (except, sometimes, delayed delivery). The problems are with my outgoing mail.

Letter of December 21, p. 2, ¶ 3. Alston Chase has sent me a fairly convincing defense against the accusations leveled at him, and I'm now pretty strongly inclined ~~to~~ to think he's honest (which of course does not imply that I find his opinions acceptable). I probably owe him an apology for having doubted him on the basis of information sent to me by people who I had reason to believe were strongly biased.

p. 2, ¶ 4. I do appreciate your effort to get Truth versus Lies into print quickly for me, and I again apologize for having had to slam on the brakes on Bonnie's account. Once I've settled the issue with him, I'll be glad to have you move ahead with publication as fast as you like, or as fast as is consistent with doing a good job.

p. 2, ¶ 5. As I think I've already told you, I don't ~~feel~~ feel it's necessary to have your contract reviewed by a lawyer. I'm willing to go ahead without that.

p. 2, last paragraph. You say you don't understand my relative indifference to sales. So I'll try to explain. I'm not completely indifferent to sales. All else being equal, I'd like the book to have a large sale. But it's not terribly important to me. It will be adequate for the satisfaction of my personal feelings if I put on record, and make available to anyone who wants to read it, the truth about my relations with my family.

Besides satisfying my personal feelings, I'd like to vindicate myself in the eyes of people whose thinking I hope to influence. Presumably such vindication will make it easier to influence them. But I hardly consider it worthwhile to try to influence the thinking of the general public. If I were to succeed in doing so, the success would be temporary, because as soon as something else came along that made a big splash in the media, they would forget what they had absorbed from me. The people whom I consider it worthwhile to address are a small minority of radicals and potential radicals who take a serious and lasting interest in the issues that concern me. Probably most such people will be on the lookout for any book written by me anyway, so it won't be necessary to "sell" it to them.

Of course, I realize that you're running a business, and that in order to keep your business in good health you have to make a profit wherever you can; so I'm quite willing to go along with your efforts to increase sales, though I'm not sure I'll go so far as to give a TV interview for that purpose.

Now let me return to your letter of December 14, p. 4, ¶14 and ¶16. From these paragraphs I gather that you are a master of two or more foreign languages. Another of my correspondents is fluent in French and has a good knowledge of German, Latin, and ancient Greek. Yet another of my

correspondents is fluent in both Polish and Ukrainian. The man in the cell next to mine, Ramzi Yousef (alleged mastermind of the World Trade Center bombing), in addition to speaking good English, is fluent in Arabic and one of the languages of Iran, ~~and~~ and knows a little of Urdu and one or two other languages.

To tell the truth, you guys make me turn green with envy. I've always been fascinated by languages, but for one reason and another I haven't learned much of them and have forgotten a great deal of what I did learn. I studied German in high school and college, and once knew the language fairly well, but I've now forgotten most of it as a result of neglecting it for 30 years. Which neglect I now regret. To satisfy the language requirement for the Ph.D. I took a two-semester reading course in French, at the end of which I could read French pretty well. But the French too I've forgotten as a result of neglect. Beginning at the age of 38, I taught myself Spanish from books. The result is that I read and write Spanish pretty well, but have hardly any competence with the spoken language.

So, as I said, I envy people who know languages. Of course, it's my own fault. But in the unlikely event that I ever have the time I may take up Turkish. Members of my defense team got me an introductory book on it, and it looks like a

fascinating language.

Turning now to p. 5, ¶ 2 of your December 14 letter, I've asked Guin Denver to send you a copy of the ms. of the manifesto that was received by the New York Times. This was provided to my defense team by the FBI. You should receive it quite soon. If you don't, please let me know. I wonder whether you might like to publish some ancillary materials with it; perhaps a sampling of letters on the subject that I've received. What do you think about this?

*

I believe I'm now caught up on answering your letters, so I can proceed to other matters. First, the mail question.

In the postscript to your letter of Dec. 14, you in effect acknowledged receipt of all my letters through December 9, 1998*. But this leaves me somewhat confused, because I thought you told me during our phone conversation of Dec. 24 that you had not received my second batch of comments on the contract, which was simply a copy of the first batch. But I probably misunderstood. So let's get this cleared up.

I've mailed you three batches of comments on the contract.

The first batch I sent by first-class mail. I handed it to an officer for mailing on Nov. 3, so it should have been postmarked within a few days after that date.

The second batch was simply a copy of the
*Or maybe only through Nov. 29. See below.

first batch, but was accompanied by a note dated Nov. 30 that began, "Since in your letter of November 23 ...". (not to be confused with my other letter of Nov. 30, which began, "I am enclosing ..."). The second batch was handed to an officer for mailing on Dec. 2. It was sent by certified mail, article number Z 438 936 818. I have a receipt for it ~~dated~~ postmarked Dec. 4, 1998.

The third batch of comments on the contract was accompanied by a letter dated Dec. 20. It was handed to an officer for mailing on Dec. 21. It was sent by certified mail, article number Z 381 420 363.

So please let me know whether you have received each of these 3 batches of comments on the contract.

Also, I'm enclosing a complete catalog of all the mail I've sent you, and I would appreciate it if you would let me know whether there are any^{items} that you have failed to receive. I need this information to help my lawyers decide what to do about the mail problems.

Now, in the postscript to your letter of Dec. 14 you stated that you had received all the letters on the list I had sent. But it's not clear whether this refers to the list I sent in my second letter of Nov. 30 (item #18), or to the list I ~~sent~~ sent in my letter of Dec. 9. (item #22). The first list comprised items #1, #2, #5-13, #15, #16. The second list comprised these items and, in addition, items #17-19 and #21. (For some reason I seem to have omitted item #20.)

Anyway, I would appreciate it if you would check whether you have received the items that are

not marked "YES" in the "RECEIVED BY FRIED" column of the catalog.

I should explain the blank space at item #25 in the "IF CERTIFIED; POSTMARK ON RECEIPT" column of the catalog. By error of the post office, this receipt was returned to me without a postmark.

In our phone conversation of Dec. 24 you suggested I might write an article in rebuttal of Chris Waits's book, and you said you could place such an article in the NY Times Magazine. Your concern, though, was that this would call attention to Waits's book. I'm not very worried about that myself, since, as I indicated earlier, I'm not so much interested in what the general public thinks as I am in the opinions of a minority of radicals, and probably most of these last will hear of Waits's book anyway.

However, an alternative might be to write an article for some Montana newspapers. The article would then be published over roughly the same area as Waits's book. Do you think it would be feasible to place such an article in several Montana newspapers? I know nothing about this sort of thing myself.

Of course, I can't write the article until I've read Waits's book. Meanwhile I may write a letter to the editor of the Missoulian in which I would discuss only the Dec. 13 Missoulian article.

As for the problem of publicizing my §2255 effort, Michael Mello some time ago suggested

the journalist William Booth as a possible substitute for Greenberg. Do you know anything about him? What do you think?

In view of the long lead time required by magazines, might we not do better to publicize the \$2255 effort through newspapers? Is it not possible to have an article placed in many newspapers throughout the country? You would know about that sort of thing—I don't.

One of my correspondents is a woman who has written a number of nursing textbooks. She's also done a good deal of ghost-writing or rewriting of similar materials. It is her philosophy to keep her writing down to the eighth- or ninth-grade level so that everyone can understand it. Twelfth-grade level, in her opinion, is too highbrow for the average person. She's also indicated that her writing is very factually-oriented; i.e., not at all imaginative.

I know that she would love to write about my case, and I'm confident that she would give me favorable treatment, but clearly she doesn't do the kind of writing that Esquire or the New York Times Magazine would want. But perhaps her style of writing would be just right for articles to be placed in newspapers. What do you think? She's one person whom I wouldn't hesitate to trust with an interview.

Enough. Not but what there's more I could say. But I have to end this letter somewhere.

Best regards, Ted

P.S. To return to the mail problem for a moment — The information you gave in your Dec. 18 letter, p. 2, ¶ 2, seems to indicate that some of my letters to you have been postmarked several days after I've handed them to an officer (generally Correctional Counselor) for mailing. This might mean that the ADX mailroom is sometimes slow to deliver letters to the post office — but C.C. swears that my letters always go to the post office on the next business day after I hand them to him — or it might mean that the post office is slow about handling the ~~mail~~ mail that it receives from the ADX.

Anyway, in order to correlate letters with envelopes and help track down the source of my mail problems, I will henceforth put an item number at the head of each of my letters to you, and I will write the same number on the flap of the envelope. Please continue to save the envelopes. Thanks.

— Ted

P.P.S. Of the damaged envelopes you've received from me, have any been sent by certified mail? If so, what was the article number?

— T.